

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 944

RC 015 516

AUTHOR Juarez, Rumaldo Z.; And Others
TITLE Preliminary Findings of a South Texas Elderly Needs Assessment Survey: A Rural-Urban Comparison of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Elderly Family Support.
PUB DATE 24 Aug 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (College Station, TX, August 24, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anglo Americans; Blacks; Comparative Analysis; Cultural Differences; Educational Attainment; Extended Family; Family (Sociological Unit); *Family Involvement; *Hispanic Americans; Mexican Americans; Middle Aged Adults; *Needs Assessment; *Older Adults; *Quality of Life; Rural Population; *Rural Urban Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Urban Population
IDENTIFIERS Family Responsibility; Texas (Cameron County); Texas (Hidalgo County); *Texas (South); Texas (Willacy County)

ABSTRACT

Elderly Hispanic and non-Hispanic rural and urban noninstitutionalized residents of three Texas counties (Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy) which border Mexico showed significant differences in educational attainment, income, occupation, and family support. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by mostly bilingual elderly volunteers. Age distribution was similar for 646 Hispanics and 155 non-Hispanics--140 Anglos and 15 Blacks; 90% of Hispanics and 33% of non-Hispanics did not complete high school; 75% of Hispanics had incomes less than \$5,000, derived primarily from government assistance; four-fifths of urban and two-thirds of rural non-Hispanics had incomes greater than \$5,000 and were several times more likely to have retirement pensions or private income; 50% of non-Hispanics and 15% of Hispanics had held white collar jobs. More non-Hispanics lived alone or with spouses; more Hispanics lived with spouses and children, children, or other kin. Both urban and rural Hispanics evidenced a more extensive, more supportive kinship network. Hispanic elderly had greater frequency of interaction with family members and received more frequent monetary support and twice as much service support from family. Survey findings may help policymakers avoid overestimating family support when reducing public services and may promote understanding of cultural differences in treatment of the elderly. (LFL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

DRAFT

ED262944

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF A SOUTH TEXAS ELDERLY NEEDS
ASSESSMENT SURVEY: A RURAL-URBAN COMPARISON OF
HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC ELDERLY FAMILY SUPPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rumaldo Z. Juarez
Manuel M. Lopez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Rumaldo Z. Juarez
Manuel M. Lopez
Pan American University

and

Leobardo L. Garcia
Area Agency on Aging

August 24, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
□ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.



Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural
Sociological Society. College Station, Texas. The
Authors acknowledge the support of the
Area Agency on Aging and the Lower Rio Grande
Development Council, McAllen, Texas.

RC015516

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF A SOUTH TEXAS ELDERLY NEEDS
ASSESSMENT SURVEY: A RURAL-URBAN COMPARISON OF
HISPANIC AND NON-HISPANIC ELDERLY FAMILY SUPPORT

It is customary in most of these types of research efforts to credit the lack of literature and/or research in one's particular topic as the motivation or reason for doing the research. In this instance, however, the motivation for the needs assessment study surfaced from the flagrant social, economic, and health needs of elderly in South Texas that are most apparent to the persons who have direct contact with elderly as service workers of elderly service agencies. Specifically, those persons who work in the Area Agency on Aging funded by the Lower Rio Grande Development Council. This is not to deemphasize the apparent lack of literature and research, as will be pointed out later, rather it is to recognize a community grass-roots effort to meet the social, economic, and health needs of an increasing elderly population in South Texas.

In this cooperative effort between the Area Agency on Aging and Pan American University, an elderly needs assessment survey was conducted in July-August 1983. At this time, it is the intent of this paper to share with you some preliminary results of the survey. The focus of the paper will be on a rural-urban comparison of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly needs and the role of the family in helping to meet these needs.

The role of the family in caring for the needs of the elderly is of concern for several reasons. From a social policy perspective is the concern for who is caring for needy elderly who have no active family support system and the

elderly public services are not reaching them either. On the other hand, if the family support system is playing a role, is it possible that the real magnitude of the elderly's problems and needs is greatly underestimated by federal, state and local programs for the elderly since the family is absorbing those needs. Also, is it possible that federal, state, and local programs for the elderly are being decreased or not as extensive as they should be because these programs assume that the family is fulfilling the needs. In essence, what these false assumptions could be contributing to is development of gaps in the elderly's welfare and security net where neither the family nor the public programs are helping to meet the needs of elderly.

From a value perspective, the role of family support in caring for the elderly could be raised from a moral or ethical view. Should society expect that the family will take on the responsibility of caring for its elders? Put more directly, should a needy parent assume and expect that when they grow old, they should be cared for by their family rather than depend on public programs for support? This concern is increasingly gaining importance as public-policy makers realize ever more that our country's current public support system for the elderly population (Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, etc.) is gradually becoming obsolete amidst the increasing and older population of persons age 65 and over in the United States (Fowles, 1983).

Further complicating this concern of the role of family support in caring for the elderly is the factor of culture. For the Mexican American, the factor is believed to be a significant factor. However, as will be pointed out later, the research to date is inconclusive. Some researchers support the contention

that the Mexican American family "take care of its elderly" while other claim it does not. cursory ethnographic research by the authors in the region where these data were obtained also point to contradictory outcomes. Directors of programs for the elderly in the region, largely as a result of their position, have identified and are aware of neglected and abused elderly who have been ignored by their family. The extent of this problem, however, is not known. In contrast, contact with individuals who are known to have elderly persons in their family appear very adamant about their responsibility of caring for their elders and are even abhorred by the thought of some family member neglecting their elders. In cases where some elders are known to be neglected by their family, it is not surprising to see the family members scorned by other members of the extended family, friends/neighbors, or staff of public service agencies. Still, what is lacking amidst this controversy are empirical studies that could help to enlighten the understanding of the family's role in caring for elderly.

While considerable research has been conducted on the role of the family in caring for elderly in the general population, (Shanas, 1979; Kart, 1981: 149-171; and Ward, 1979: 293-307) research of this type is in its infancy stage for Mexican American elderly and practically nonexistent on rural Mexican American elderly. As indicated earlier though, what literature does exist on the Mexican American elderly seems to identify two contrasting opinions. On the one hand, investigators such as Streib (1977), Leonard (1967), Madsen (1969), Sotomayor (1971) and Rubel (1966), support the idea that the extended family is the most important social support system and that it takes care of the Mexican American elderly in a positive and rewarding manner. On the other hand, investigators such as Maldonado

(1975), Wilson and Heinert (1977), Montiel (1970) and Crouch (1972), suggest that this may be a stereotype and a myth. According to Wilson and Heinert (1977: 24),

An extensive ethnographic literature exists which has attributed a distinctive family character to Mexican Americans. It can be summed up as portraying the Chicano as contemporary representatives of the folk society, with kinship bonds far stronger and more supportive than are found in the contemporary, urbanized, nuclear, Anglo family unit. It was only among Mexican American respondents themselves that these popular viewpoints were forcefully repudiated as stereotypical myths.

The most recent research on this issue of family support of Mexican American elderly is that of Markides, Martin and Gomez (1983). Markides et al. study was based on a sample of 363 Mexican Americans and 156 Anglo elderly age 60 and over living in San Antonio, Texas. The data were collected in 1976. Using an "intergenerational solidarity index" Markides et al. concluded that comparisons between Chicano and Anglo elderly:

...did not indicate the older Chicanos were more likely to report closer relations or exhibit greater solidarity with their children. These findings suggest a minimum that the traditional view of the Mexican American family in which older members enjoy a sheltered position is somewhat overdrawn. While this view may have had validity at an earlier time when the Chicano population was mostly rural, the place of older Chicanos in the family must be evaluated in its urban-industrial context. (1983: 39-40)

In the discussion which follows, an attempt is made to elucidate further the issue of the family support system of both Mexican American and Anglo elderly living in rural and urban areas. At this preliminary stage of analysis the discussion will be largely descriptive and of an exploratory nature.

METHODS:

Data for this study were obtained from an elderly needs assessment survey conducted by the Area Agency on Aging of South Texas. The area served by this agency covers Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy counties. All three counties are on the border with Mexico. The data were collected in July-August 1983 through personal interviews. A stratified random sampling process was used to obtain the sample of 801 non-institutionalized elderly. The population consisted of 45,777 households which had one or more persons age 60 or over in the three counties. This age category was selected because the persons served by the Area Agency on Aging starts at age 60. By this method, 52 census tracts were canvassed in Cameron county, 53 in Hidalgo and 3 in Willacy. Willacy county was oversampled to ensure a larger number of sampled elderly in the largely rural county. Of the 801 elderly 646 (80.6 percent) were Hispanic and the remaining 155 (19.4 percent) were Non-Hispanic. Not surprisingly, 98 percent of the Hispanic sample was of Mexican origin. Of the Non-Hispanic sample, 88 percent were Anglo and about 10 percent were Black (n=15). Overall, about three-fourths of the sample was urban. While most of the places identified as urban had a population of 2,500 or more, a few communities were classified as rural based on knowledge about these communities by the authors. Examples of these were Port Isabel and La Feria, two relatively isolated communities in Willacy county.

The data were collected by face-to-face interview using a questionnaire that took approximately 20-35 minutes to administer. The questionnaire was translated to Spanish and pre-tested. Twenty-seven interviewers were used for

conducting the survey. Most of them (85 percent) were elderly volunteers recruited from the various organizations that serve the elderly. For the most part, all of these interviewers were bilingual Spanish/English-speaking persons. Interviewers who spoke only English were assigned to census tracts known to be inhabited by English-speaking persons only. Put another way, the "Anglo" part of town. The interviewer's received an eight-hour training session on interviewing techniques and canvassing instructions. Prior to the start of the survey a public media campaign was launched in the areas where the survey was to take place.

DISCUSSION:

In general, the age distributions of our sample of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly are relatively similar with only a few small differences. Realizing that there are significant socioeconomic, functional, and health differences within the aged population, the sample was grouped into three age-categories: young-old (60-65), middle-old (66-75), and old-old (76+). Roughly 30 percent of elderly from both groups (Hispanics and Non-Hispanics) are in the young-old category and slightly over forty percent from both groups are in the middle-old category. The two groups do differ slightly in the old-old category which has about one-fourth of the Hispanic elderly compared to 32 percent of the Non-Hispanic. This outcome was not surprising in light of vital statistics data which indicate that white elderly persons have a slight longevity edge over the Hispanic aged (Juarez, 1981). About three-fourths of all elderly live in urban areas. Nevertheless, there do seem to be some slight differences when the two groups are compared within age categories by rural-urban residence. Among the young-old, there are a smaller proportion of Non-Hispanic elderly (23.5 percent) living in rural areas than

Hispanic (31 percent). This outcome is reversed in the middle-old category where a larger proportion of Non-Hispanic than Hispanic elderly live in rural areas. In the old-old category, more of the Non-Hispanic elderly live in urban areas than the Hispanic.

[Table 1 about here]

Other than the slight difference in rural-urban residence between the two groups, the age homogeneity of the two groups can be observed in Table 2. The almost identical low age-range of 60 for the two groups is explained by the selection criterion established for the sample, i.e. persons aged 60+. The high age-range for Hispanics was 97 and for Non-Hispanics, 91. Again, in light of vital statistics information, this age difference in longevity "favoring" the Hispanic was not expected. One probable explanation might be that the older Non-Hispanics were not in the sample because they may be in nursing homes. Since this was a sample of non-institutionalized elderly, they were excluded from the sample. One similarity between the two groups is that the high age for either Hispanic or Non-Hispanic elderly was in the urban category. Both the mean and the median for both groups regardless of area of residence are very similar, i.e. about age 70.

[Table 2 about here]

That females outnumber the males in both groups regardless of where they lived is not surprising, Table 3. This outcome was expected since there are more women in the population aged 60 and above. The only notable difference is the smaller proportion of Non-Hispanic males (29.4 percent) living in rural areas.

[Table 3 about here]

Almost half of the elderly from all four groups (Hispanic rural and urban and Non-Hispanic rural and urban) reported that they were married, Table 4.

As expected, the next largest category of marital status for all groups was the widowed. For the most part, rural-urban comparisons for the two ethnic groups are very similar across all marital status categories with one exception, the "never married." A larger proportion of never married Hispanics (6.7 percent) were in the urban areas than Non-Hispanic in the same group (0.8 percent). In contrast, there were more never married Non-Hispanics (15.2 percent) living in rural areas than there were never married Hispanics (4.7 percent) living in rural areas.

[Table 4 about here]

Not surprisingly, Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly differed considerably in their levels of education attained, Table 5. Over ninety percent of Hispanics from either rural or urban areas had not completed high school as compared to about one-third of Non-Hispanic elderly. Among the Non-Hispanic elderly, however, those from rural areas were less likely to have completed high school. The largest proportion of Non-Hispanic elderly from either rural or urban areas had completed high school or technical school. Only two percent of Hispanic elderly had completed college compared to about 18 percent of the Non-Hispanics.

[Table 5 about here]

Hispanic elderly from both rural and urban areas are also largely concentrated in the low income category (\$5,000 or less). Nearly three-fourths of the Hispanics reported a family income of \$5,000 or less compared to about one-fifth of the urban Non-Hispanics and one-third of the rural Non-Hispanics. While over one-third of rural and urban Non-Hispanics are in the high income category (\$10,000 or more), there are only about one-twentieth Hispanics. The largest proportion of Non-Hispanics are in the middle income category (\$5-\$10K).

[Table 6 about here]

The most frequent source reported by all elderly was Social Security, Table 7. Considerably more of the Hispanic elderly from both rural and urban areas

were on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Food Stamps. In light of the discussion on family income and levels of education for Hispanic elderly, these sources of income are not surprising. Nearly three times as many urban Non-Hispanics than urban Hispanics reported income from a retirement pension. In the rural areas, this difference was more drastic, i.e. nearly eight times. One probable explanation for such a large difference in the rural elderly is the larger number of elderly whose occupation was farmworker. About equal proportions of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly reported receiving some income from other family members. This similarity, however, disappears for the rural elderly where about 16 percent of the rural Hispanic elderly reported family support compared to three percent of the rural Non-Hispanic. One other major difference is in the category of income from private sources. Nearly seven times as many urban Non-Hispanics than Hispanics and two times as many urban Non-Hispanics than urban Hispanics reported income from private sources.

[Table 7 about here]

In response to a question about the respondent's quality of life, nearly half of the Hispanic rural elderly and one-third of the rural Non-Hispanics indicated a condition that was worse than five years ago. Among the urban respondents, Hispanic elderly responded in the negative at more than twice the rate of Non-Hispanic elderly, Table 8.

[Table 8 about here]

The previous discussion of elderly's education and income levels set the groundwork for what's to be expected about their occupational status. Both rural and urban Hispanics were poorly represented in the white collar occupations when compared to the rural and urban Non-Hispanics. Nearly half of the latter reported a current or past occupation in the white collar category compared to about 15 percent of the Hispanics, Table 9. Since traditionally Hispanic females have not been part of the labor force, it was not surprising

to find half of the rural Hispanics in the housewife occupation and over 40 percent of the urban. Of those who indicated an occupation, however, only about 10-15 percent of both Hispanics and Non-Hispanics were currently employed, Table 10. The majority of both Hispanics and Non-Hispanics that were employed were on a part-time basis, Table 12. Not unexpected, among both groups those who reported that they were unemployed, the majority were retired, Table 11. Worthy of noting, however, is the larger proportion of Hispanics than Non-Hispanics who reported a handicapped condition.

[Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12 about here]

One indicator of family support is the type of residential accommodations of the elderly. Table 13 illustrates the distribution of six different types of residential accommodations. Hispanic and Non-Hispanic differences are clearly evident. Regardless of area of residence, proportionately more Non-Hispanics live alone than Hispanics. Larger proportions of Non-Hispanics than Hispanics live with their spouse but larger proportions of Hispanics live with their spouse and children. Also, larger proportions of Hispanics than Non-Hispanics live with their children only and more of the Hispanic than Non-Hispanic elderly live with other kin.

[Table 13 about here]

In an effort to assess the extent of relatives' assistance to the elderly, the respondents were asked to list their relatives, indicate the frequency of visits, and the type of assistance the family members provided. These results are reported in Tables 14, 15 and 16.

The figures indicated in Table 14 represent a conservative estimate of the number of the elderly's relatives. In general, it indicates that urban Hispanic elderly have about four times as many relatives living in the same house with them as Non-Hispanics and about six times those living in rural areas. Urban Hispanics also have 2.8 relatives living in the Valley Region compared to the

1.2 for urban Non-Hispanics. Among rural elderly, Hispanics have about 3.3 relatives living in the region compared to 1.6 for Non-Hispanics. In contrast, Non-Hispanic elderly have about twice as many relatives living out-of-state as Hispanics. In other words, the extended family among Hispanics in the Valley appears to be more frequent than for Non-Hispanics.

[Table 14 about here]

Having relatives living close-by does not mean family support for the elder takes place. There must also be some contact between the elderly person and his/her relatives. To measure this, a question about frequency of contact followed the question about proximity of relatives. These results are illustrated in Table 15. The pattern of visitation evident among both rural and urban elderly is one of more frequent daily and weekly visitations among Hispanics than Non-Hispanics. As the distance between visits increases, the frequency of visitations decreases for Hispanic elderly but shows a slight increase for the Non-Hispanics.

[Table 15 about here]

Proximity to the elderly and frequency of visitations still does not indicate that some type of assistance is being provided. To measure this another follow-up question was used to assess whether any assistance was being provided and if so, what type of assistance. These results are presented in Table 16. Basically, the results indicate that urban Hispanics are frequented with more monetary assistance than urban Non-Hispanics but rural Non-Hispanics are frequented with more monetary assistance than rural Hispanics. When it comes to services, Hispanics from both rural and urban areas are frequented with services at about twice the rate of Non-Hispanics. Very few of both Hispanics and Non-Hispanics are provided with both money and services and about equal proportions of elderly from both groups do not receive any assistance at all.

[Table 16 about here]

Another area indicative of family support is the issue of transportation. The Hispanic elderly, both rural and urban, are more likely to rely on relatives for transportation assistance than either urban or rural Non-Hispanics; nearly three times as likely for urban Hispanics compared to urban Non-Hispanics and about one-third more likely for rural Hispanics vis-a-vis rural Non-Hispanics, Table 17. Conversely, urban Non-Hispanics are more than twice as likely to drive themselves than their urban Hispanic counterparts. In a reversal of the earlier pattern, rural Non-Hispanics are one-third more likely to drive themselves than are rural Hispanics. Hispanics are also more likely to rely on others for transportation assistance than their Non-Hispanic counterparts. While these differences are partially explained by ethnic differentials in the number of respondents with a physical condition restricting activity to the home, they are also indicative of a greater need for self-reliance among Non-Hispanics resulting from a less extensive support network of kin (see Tables 15 and 16). The more extensive reliance of Hispanic elderly on assistance from non-relatives when compared to urban, and to an unexpectedly lesser extent rural, Non-Hispanics can indicate their greater integration into the total community as opposed to a possible insulation from the same larger community on the part of urban Non-Hispanics.

[Table 17 about here]

Focussing our attention on the homebound, we see again the more extensive and developed kinship network of the Hispanic elderly. Whereas nineteen percent of the urban and roughly sixty-three percent of the rural Hispanic homebound elderly receive no monetary or service assistance from relatives, the comparable figures for the Non-Hispanic elderly are 42 percent for urban residents and 92 percent for rural respondents, Table 18. For the bed-ridden homebound the contrast is even more striking: only 7 percent of the bed-ridden urban and 27 percent of rural Hispanic elderly receive no assistance from their relatives. The

corresponding figures for the bed-ridden Non-Hispanic elderly are one-third of urban residents receiving no assistance and all cases (N= 3) of rural elderly receiving no assistance. The evidence appears indicative of a more extensive, more supportive Hispanic than Non-Hispanic kinship network within the Valley region.

[Table 18 about here]

Conclusion:

As indicated by the title of our paper, these results are preliminary. A more sophisticated level of analysis using multivariate models lies ahead. Clearly, controlling for such variables as ethnicity and social class will greatly strengthen our results and help to examine further the issue of family support.

Overall, there appears to be room for improvement for family support of both Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly. The Hispanic elderly seems to have greater frequency of interaction with family members than Non-Hispanic and also seem to receive more frequent support of a monetary and service nature than Non-Hispanic. Especially apparent are the much larger proportions of Hispanic elderly than Non-Hispanic who rely on relatives for transportation. The type of support received most frequently by both Hispanic and Non-Hispanic elderly is services rather than monetary. Being that Hispanic elderly are for the most part in a low class status, this could be one area of needed increased support. Also evident between the two groups is the greater degree of support received by Hispanic elderly than Non-Hispanic elderly who are homebound or bed-ridden. Obvious for both groups are the proportions who aren't receiving any type of support from the family.

What remains to be investigated is a measure of "Need" for family support in both groups. Also, what are the advantages and disadvantages of presence of the extended family for both the elderly and the family members affected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crouch, B. M.
1972 "Age and institutional support: perceptions of older Mexican Americans." Journal of Gerontology 72:524-529.
- Fowles, Donald
1983 "The changing older population." Aging, May-June:7-11.
- Kart, Cary S.
1981 The Realities of Aging. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Leonard, O. E.
1967 The Older Rural Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest in Older Rural Americans, E. C. Youmans (ed.), University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, Kentucky.
- Madsen, W.
1964 The Mexican Americans of South Texas. New York: Rinehart and Winston.
- Maldonado, D., Jr.
1975 "The Chicano aged." Social Work 20:213-216.
- Markides, K. S.; H. W. Martin and E. Gomez
1983 Older Mexican Americans: A Study in an Urban Barrio. Monograph No. 7, Center for Mexican American Studies, the University of Texas at Austin.
- Montiel, H.
1970 "The social science myth of the Mexican-American family." El Grito 2:56-63.
- Rubel, A.
1966 Across the Tracks: Mexican Americans in a Texas City. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Shanas, Ethel
1979 "Social myth as hypothesis: the case of the family relations of old people." The Gerontologist 19:3-9
- Sotomayor, M.
1971 "Mexican American interaction with social systems." Social Casework 52:316-322.
- Streib, G.
1976 Social Stratification and Aging. Pp. 160-185 in R. Binstock and E. Shanas (eds.), Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.
- Ward, Russel A.
1979 The Aging Experience: An Introduction to Social Gerontology. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Wilson, H. S. and J. Heinert
1977 "Los viejitos, the old ones." Journal of Gerontological Nursing 3:19-25.

Table 1. Respondents' Age Categorization by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

AGE CATEGORIES	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Young Old (60-65)	139	29.4	54	31.0	33	27.3	8	23.5
Middle Old (66-75)	203	43.0	84	48.3	46	38.0	19	55.9
Old Old (76+)	130	27.5	36	20.7	42	34.7	7	20.6
N =	472	100%	174	100%	121	100%	34	100%

Table 2. Respondents' Age Characteristics by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

AGE RANGE	HISPANIC		NON-HISPANIC	
	URBAN	RURAL	URBAN	RURAL
Low	60.0	60.0	60.0	62.0
High	97.0	91.0	91.0	86.0
Mean	71.0	69.9	71.9	70.5
Median	70.4	69.1	70.9	70.0
N =	472	174	121	34

Table 3. Respondents' Sex by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

SEX	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
MALE	184	39.0	75	43.1	50	41.3	10	29.4
FEMALE	288	61.0	99	56.9	71	58.7	24	70.6
N=	472	100%	174	100%	121	100%	34	100%

Table 4. Respondents' Marital Status by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

MARITAL STATUS	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Married	221	47.5	87	50.9	58	47.9	16	48.5
Widowed	189	40.6	68	39.8	54	44.6	12	36.4
Divorced	16	3.4	4	2.3	8	6.6	0	0
Separated	8	1.7	4	2.3	0	0	0	0
Never Married	31	6.7	8	4.7	1	.8	5	15.2
N =	465	100%	171	100%	121	100%	33	100%
No data	7		3		0		1	

Table 5. Respondents' Education by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

EDUCATION ATTAINED	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Less than High School	340	91.9	114	93.4	36	31.0	12	37.5
High School or Technical School	21	5.7	7	5.7	59	50.9	14	43.8
College Graduate	9	2.4	1	.8	21	18.1	6	18.8
N =	370	100%	122	100%	116	100%	32	100%
No data	102		52		5		2	

Table 6. Respondents' Present Income by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

INCOME CATEGORIES	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Low	335	73.8	134	77.9	24	22.0	11	32.4
Middle	98	21.6	34	19.8	45	41.3	12	35.3
High	21	4.6	4	2.3	40	36.7	11	32.4
N =	454	100%	172	100%	109	100%	34	100%
No data	18		2		12		0	

Table 7. Elderly's Source of Income by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

SOURCE	HISPANIC		NON-HISPANIC	
	URBAN (N=461)	RURAL (N=169)	URBAN (N=119)	RURAL (N= 34)
Social Security	355	115	100	31
SSI	214	68	9	8
Salary	36	14	14	3
Retirement Pension	40	10	37	15
VA Pension	27	7	10	2
AFDC	3	4	1	0
Disability	14	5	6	3
Unemployment	5	2	0	1
Family Support	34	27	9	1
Food Stamps	148	63	11	4
Private source	13	12	27	6
Other, unspecified	6	1	8	2
No data	11	5	2	0

Table 8. Quality of Life Compared to Five Years Earlier by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

QUALITY of LIFE	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Much Worse	52	11.2	19	10.8	2	1.7	1	2.9
Worse	142	30.7	66	37.9	21	17.4	10	29.4
About the Same	177	38.2	39	22.4	70	57.9	11	32.4
Better	78	16.8	49	28.2	24	19.8	12	35.3
Much Better	14	3.0	1	.6	4	3.3	0	0
N =	463	100%	174	100%	121	100%	34	100%
No data	9		0		0		0	

Table 9. Respondents' Occupational Status by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
White Collar	62	13.2	26	15.3	56	47.1	17	51.5
Blue Collar	211	44.9	59	34.7	34	28.6	7	21.2
Housewife	197	41.9	85	50.0	29	24.4	9	27.3
N =	470	100%	170	100%	119	100%	33	100%
No data	2		4		2		1	

Table 10. Respondents' Present Employment Status by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Employed	50	10.7	23	13.2	19	15.8	4	12.1
Not Employed	418	89.3	151	86.8	101	84.2	29	87.9
N =	468	100%	174	100%	120	100%	33	100%
No data	4		0		1		1	

Table 11. Respondents' Reasons for Not Working by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

REASONS	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Retired	277	58.7	74	42.5	70	64.5	21	61.8
Laid Off	17	3.6	7	4.0	1	.8	1	2.9
Handicapped	74	15.7	29	16.1	13	10.7	2	5.9
Other	7	1.5	3	1.7	2	1.7	0	0
Never Worked	27	5.7	37	21.3	8	6.6	6	17.6
No Data	70	14.8	25	14.4	19	15.7	4	11.8
N =	472	100%	174	100%	121	100%	34	100%

Table 12. Nature of Employment for Employed Respondents by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Full-time employment	21	47.7	9	47.4	6	40.0	1	33.3
Part-time employment	23	52.3	10	52.6	9	60.0	2	66.7
N =	44	100%	19	100%	15	100%	3	100%
No data	6		4		4		1	

Table 13. Type of Residential Accommodation by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Live alone	136	28.8	47	27.0	52	43.0	14	41.2
Live w/ spouse	139	29.4	57	32.8	52	43.0	17	50.0
Live w/ spouse and children	75	15.9	31	17.8	7	5.8	0	0
Live w/ children	80	16.9	28	16.1	4	3.3	1	2.9
Live w/ other kin	36	7.6	9	5.2	5	4.1	0	0
Live w/ unrelated individual(s)	6	1.3	2	1.1	1	.8	2	5.9
N =	472	100%	174	100%	121	100%	34	100%

Table 14. Residence Location of Elderly's Relatives¹ by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

LOCATION	HISPANIC		NON-HISPANIC	
	URBAN (N=432)	RURAL (N=160)	URBAN (N=106)	RURAL (N= 30)
Same House	359	115	22	4
Valley Region	1,219	522	123	47
State	253	87	94	22
Out-of-State	317	112	131	33
No data	(40)	(14)	(15)	(4)

¹ Tabular presentation is limited to those respondents (N= 728) answering affirmatively to a question on living relatives. Spouses are not included in the above data.

Table 15. Relatives' Frequency of Visits to Elderly¹ by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

FREQUENCY	HISPANIC		NON-HISPANIC	
	URBAN (N=432)	RURAL (N=160)	URBAN (N=106)	RURAL (N= 30)
Daily	715	227	36	26
Weekly	591	199	58	13
Every other week	135	79	21	9
Monthly	174	119	64	7
Twice a year	172	91	72	10
Once a year	263	85	78	25
Other	95	27	42	14
No data	(40)	(14)	(15)	(4)

¹ Tabular presentation is based only on those respondents (N= 728) answering affirmatively to a question on living relatives. Spouses are not included among relatives in the above data.

Table 16. Relatives' Assistance to Elderly¹ by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	HISPANIC		NON-HISPANIC	
	URBAN (N=432)	RURAL (N=160)	URBAN (N=106)	RURAL (N= 30)
Monetary	100	52	18	14
Services	1,085	405	108	22
Both Monetary and Services	50	6	2	0
No Assistance	913	373	242	70
No data	(40)	(14)	(15)	(4)

¹ Tabular presentation is based only on those respondents (N= 728) answering affirmatively to a question on living relatives. Spouses are not included among relatives in the above data.

Table 17. Elderly's Type of Transportation by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

TYPE	HISPANIC				NON-HISPANIC			
	URBAN		RURAL		URBAN		RURAL	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Self	152	32.8	59	34.1	90	74.4	16	47.1
Relatives	207	44.6	79	45.7	18	14.9	12	35.3
Others	105	22.6	35	20.2	13	10.7	6	17.6
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
N=	464	100%	173	100%	121	100%	34	100%
No data	8		1		0		0	

Table 18. Relatives' Assistance to Homebound Elderly by Rural-Urban Residence and Ethnicity

REASONS for HOMEBOUND	TYPE of ASSISTANCE								TOTAL N
	MONEY		SERVICES		BOTH		NONE		
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
<u>Physical Condition</u>									
Urban Residence									
Hispanic	9	90.0	63	91.3	9	100	19	79.2	100
Non-Hispanic	1	10.0	6	8.7	0	0	5	20.8	12
Rural Residence									
Hispanic	4	80.0	18	100	1	100	39	78.0	62
Non-Hispanic	1	20.0	0	0	0	0	11	22.0	12
<u>Bed-Ridden</u>									
Urban Residence									
Hispanic	2	100	22	91.7	4	100	2	66.7	30
Non-Hispanic	0	0	2	8.3	0	0	1	33.3	3
Rural Residence									
Hispanic	2	100	6	100	0	0	3	50.0	11
Non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	50.0	3